



POLICY COMMITTEE

April 8, 2016
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes April 8, 2016 Council Chambers #115

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Jason Banach, Jim Ude, Lisa Ridge, Geoff McKim, Adam Wason, Andrew Cibor, Kent McDaniel, Richard Martin, Kevin Tolloty, David Walter, Andy Ruff, Iris Kiesling, Mohammad Hajeer

Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Emily Avers

Others: Dimas Praditya, Paul Satterly, Barb Qualls, Nan Brewer, Joan Keeler, Mary Ann Williams, Germaine Codwin, Stephanie Campbell

I. Call to Order: Introductions were made

II. Approval of the Minutes

a. March 11, 2016

Richard Martin moved for approval. McKim seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

III. Communications from the Chair: None at this time.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

a. Citizens Advisory Committee: David Walter said he is serving for Sarah Ryterband. She wanted me to mention we are concerned about the process of design review. Our understanding is that design review had been held and after the design review was completed several citizens came forward and asked about the design process and when they would be able to have additional input into the process and were told they were too late. That is a concern we have, is if there is more opportunity to look at the design as it evolves, citizen input may provide means and methods of reducing costs or at least answering questions about why things have to be designed the way they are. I understand this process. In my other life I'm an architect and I always try to listen to my clients until the day we start pouring concrete. I'm always open to suggestions and maybe changes will come up that there are perfectly good reasons why you can't do them, whether it's cost or the design requirements that come from FHWA, but what happens is a lot of citizens get upset because they feel they've been shut out of the process.

b. Technical Advisory Committee: Andrew Cibor said at our previous meeting the MPO staff prepared a summary overview of the Unified Planning Work Program outline. There wasn't a draft. We just focused on the outline.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff: None at this time.

VI. Old Business: None at this time.

VII. New Business

a. Project Design Process and Public Input Discussion

Josh Desmond presented. We wanted to have a conversation in response to the CAC discussion about project design and public input and how those things work in the project development process and how they may or may not be working effectively in our local process. I want to give some basic facts for us to consider, give a little background about why are we here having this discussion, some basic generalization about what the project development process is, some issues to consider about what may or may not be working, and some thoughts about where do we go from here to resolve some of these issues. I'll tell you right up front I don't have all the answers right now. I'm hoping we can start to arrive at some during our discussion. We've heard a lot of dissatisfaction with the level and type of public input in the project development process. There have been a lot of questions about how much public input is required in the process of developing a federal aid project, is that required minimum level of input enough to deal with what the concerns are, and how should our LPAs who are the owners of these projects respond to that public input. What should their method of dealing with public input be regarding the design decisions they make about their projects. We also heard concerns about the project designs that are resulting; are those designs really appropriate based on an analysis of the data and issues involved in the project, have those designs responded appropriately to the public input that was gathered during the process and is it ever too late to change a project design? What is the tipping point in terms of whether the LPA can or should be still making changes to a project in response to the input from the community? That's why we're having this discussion at the MPO level about what our issues are and what we can do about it.

I'll give you a very simple overview of a very complex and challenging process of the steps a project has to go through to come to fruition. The local public agency (LPA) is any local government agency that sponsors a project, like Ellettsville, City of Bloomington, or Monroe County that "owns" a project. They're paying for it, or a share of it. They're the ones signing the contract with the design consultant, they have the final authority over how that project happens. An LPA decides to build a project and get some federal money to pay for a portion of it. They come up with a preliminary scope and a preliminary cost estimate and then take that cost estimate to the MPO to make a formal request. If their request is approved, it is then amended into the local MPO TIP which allows it to take advantage of the federal funds. There are 3 phases a project goes through- preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition, and construction. There are a lot of interim steps within each of these large steps. During the preliminary engineering phase you go through the NEPA process, which is the environmental review of the proposed project. It could be an environmental impact statement, which is the most thorough, in depth and lengthy of those, it could be a an environmental assessment which is an intermediate level scan, or it could be a project where you are approved to bypass some or all of the environmental review process. There's also the engineering design where you have a consultant that you've signed a contract with and they go through a design process. Usually they help do the environmental review as part of their design work. They complete the data collection and analysis they need to help inform their design. There's public input and hearings held as part of the process, they go through a process of developing alternative solutions to the possible project, select a final project they believe is the right project for that location and they go through design iterations to refine the design to a point where the LPA thinks they've solved the problem they set out to solve. Once the design is to a pretty substantial point, they're ready to move into the right-of-way acquisition phase. The project has to be to a point where you have a pretty good idea what additional property may be required to facilitate the construction of the project. If you're changing the configuration of an intersection, widening lanes, adding sidewalks and tree plots, typically you'll need to purchase additional property outside of the existing right-of-way. You'll go through the right-of-way acquisition process where all the properties you identify are appraised, offers made, negotiations of purchase prices if the owner wants to go back and forth a little bit. Those acquisitions will be finalized which means making the payments to the property owners and recording the deeds and all the other paperwork that has to be done when property is changing hands. Once that's all acquired there's a final certification process where it's submitted to INDOT for approval. Then the project moves to the construction phase. The

project is let for bids. That is all taken care of by INDOT because they control all the federal funding. Those happen on a monthly basis except for twice a year when they take a break. Usually the lowest bid that meets all the requirements of the project will be awarded as the contractor for that particular project. There's a process of finalizing a contract with that constructor and getting all the funding authorized by the MPO. There's a separate process where a construction inspection is awarded in conjunction with the construction contract for a separate entity, usually another consulting firm, to be the construction inspector to make sure those who are building the project are meeting all the requirements and specifications that were approved for that project so at the end of the project you get what you expected based on the plans and specifications you put together. After all that is said and done, they go through a list to make sure all the details were taken care of in terms of the infrastructure. There's a final project audit and close out to make sure all payments were settled appropriately. There is a lot more detail about what goes on but I want to make sure everyone knows a broad overview of the process.

One of the question that has come up is what is the appropriate amount or type of public input on a project. Of course for NEPA there are certain minimum requirements you have to meet and those are certified along the way as you go through the process. There are issues about the format of the meetings and public input opportunities. There are some formal hearings required where you have 5 minutes to say what you want to say and your comments are documented, but it is not an interactive discussion. That's very different from having an open house or a round table discussion with the designers and the LPA where you have an interactive conversation and you're trying to listen and respond in the moment. It's important to make a distinction about the different types of input that are required. Do we have to stop at the minimum? Is that enough? Should we be looking for other ways to get public input? Another question that has come up and raised some concern is how should an LPA respond to the public input they receive? The NEPA process has certain requirements for documenting comments and providing written responses, but is that enough? Are there other avenues for dialogue and design changes that could be incorporated in addition to the minimum standards that are put out for the environmental review? The other question is can an LPA make changes late in the process? Yes, changes can be made at any time in the process. The real question is how many steps will you have to go back and re-do to make that design change? The LPA has to weigh if it is worth stepping back and redoing those steps. It's a bit of a balancing act for the LPA and they're the ones who have to decide. It's a difficult balance to strike. Ultimately the LPA is in control of their own projects and they have to make a decision based on their own parameters. There are NEPA and other state/federal requirements that need to be met, so those decisions aren't made in a vacuum. And of course for the public there's a desire to have more meaningful public input in the design process. One of the options may be to look at the Complete Streets policy to see if there's are requirements we can include regarding public input as part of the design development process. Maybe be more explicit about what our expectations as an MPO for public participation and the LPAs response to that input during the design process. That's just one suggestion. We are open to other thoughts about how to deal with this. We wanted to put this all on the table today to give you a chance to express any concerns or ideas or suggestions you might have as part of dealing with the project development process.

McKim asked if there are any best practices from other jurisdictions with respect to public input?

Desmond said we've looked into those a little bit as we've been working on our Complete Streets policy revision. I don't have them in front of me, but they're out there. Every jurisdiction takes it differently based on what's appropriate for them, but I think there are a lot of good ideas out there.

Andy Ruff said I would like to see the public have input after the committee has had discussion and come back to the committee for additional discussion.

McDaniel said I'd like you to make a motion for that.

****Ruff made a motion for the MPO Policy Committee to have additional discussion after hearing public comment. McKim seconded.**

Martin said as long as we're talking about a generic process and not a specific process I think we'll have a meaningful discussion. I'm aware this is being generated because of a particular project but I don't think the context of the discussion should be that particular project. It should be about our responsibilities and our actions as an MPO with respect to all the projects that are coming before us and how we manage them.

Ruff said I understand and I agree but I think there will be a fine line between using the project we're talking about as an example if people are using that to illustrate the larger problem.

McDaniel said it will be difficult to make a distinction. I would prefer people keep the discussion to the process, but I think it will be impossible to do that.

Martin said if we focus on one particular project with respect to this entire process, then we're ignoring all the others that have been done without this level of concern. There has to be something particular about what happened with that process, which is different from what happened with the others, when somebody didn't come forward and say anything. To the extent that most of the public input is the responsibility of the LPA, not the MPO, that's where the focus has to be. We can talk about how we might think about the adequacy of the public input that's occurring at the LPAs but ultimately it's their decision as long as they are consistent with the requirements that INDOT and FHWA set for that process. I don't want to end up where we have one LPA calling the other LPA inadequate.

Cibor said he appreciates the presentation staff led us through- I think that was a fair and good overview of the project process- but I want to understand what we're trying to get out of this. What is the purpose of discussing this?

Desmond said we would like to hear directly from the public what their concerns are and then get guidance from you what steps we should take as an MPO to respond to that. Should it be part of our Complete Streets policy to look at these things in more depth and require more public input? What do you think the MPO's role should be?

McDaniel clarified you're looking for direction as to how we define our public input process?

Desmond said yes.

****Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.**

Ruff said are the LPAs currently consulting with MPO staff on their public input plans? Do they take advantage of consulting with staff about how best to do this?

Desmond said we get responses on Complete Streets compliance. There are steps in that process for public input. Our role to this point has been to check off if they've filled in the right blanks. There hasn't been an ongoing discussion about when or where or how to have meetings.

Ruff said would staff see it reasonable, practical and valuable to develop a more formal policy of public input process for all the LPAs to use as a guide? I know there are models and other things out there. Bloomington and Monroe County are not typical for Indiana and we have a strong tradition of public input and participation that is probably more than a lot of places have.

Desmond said it could be helpful. A guidebook could be of use to people.

Ruff said do you foresee we could eventually adopt it as a policy? Or would that be stepping on the LPA's autonomy too much?

Kiesling said the LPAs have been good at giving early notice to the MPO. I think they've been involved at various stages.

Martin said what could we ask the LPAs to do that they aren't already doing to move this process along? What other kinds of things could we consider asking them to do?

Ruff said you talked about timing and at what point in the process does making changes based on public input have different levels of impact. Maybe a more standardized time line for the process of input relative to design would be beneficial.

Desmond said that's something we've been looking at in our process of updating our Complete Streets policy. What are the checkpoints the LPA needs to make with the public and the MPO to make sure they're still on track to be a Complete Street project? We may need to look at it as a policy beyond just Complete Streets, look at it for any TIP project, but that's a discussion we can have later.

Russ said to revisit that whole concept with the idea of the main intention being to maximize the opportunity... We live in a time when things change fast. Information exchanged through the technology we have now, it's not like it used to be. Maybe revisit that whole concept with the idea we need to maximize the breathing room... It's one thing to take input. It's another thing to implement. We saw that with INDOT. The more time you have for that before you've invested too much that it's not able to change.

Martin said there is the issue of thinking about the transportation system we have and we try to do that through updates to our thoroughfare plan because we realize you can't build or not build a road without impacting the other pieces of the system. In these long term projects strategies are identified early on that take into consideration the impacts that occur on all parts of the transportation system. As you move forward in the plan, as you get closer to completing the implementation, making changes at that point in time is very expensive, to go back and in many cases redo your thoroughfare plan. We don't do a good job making those systemic level changes in our planning. We are aware that decisions we make about individual projects always impact the whole system. So while there are a lot of dynamics going on in this, we can't just pick one thing up and not worry about what else we're doing to the system as a consequence of that. We ask each of our LPAs to come up with a long term plan for transportation and we expect them to be executing that. These are projects that take a long time, sometimes decades, to complete. Many of the projects we've been seeing recently have been sitting on the books for 10 or 20 years and we're finally getting to the point where we have the financial resources to move forward on them. So while there are a lot of dynamics going on in the system and it's changing, you can't respond to every change without taking into consequence the systemic consequences of the changes you're making as you move forward. You have to go back a lot farther than people want to go back and you're essentially restarting this whole process again. That's why we do long range transportation planning. For those plans to be effective you have to adhere to them. It may not be what you would like to do if you had other choices, but we don't have other choices because we're a large community. As we update the long range transportation plan, some of the decisions that were made a long time ago are going to be revised and we will do things differently, but until the plan is completed and we've looked at the transportation network as a whole, it's difficult to make changes. If you don't put a road where you had planned, where is the traffic going to go? These are issues we have to deal with. We're seeing increases in mass transit but we have little capability to accommodate busses on our streets. That's part of our planning that's going to have to change going forward is to make sure you accommodate mass transit

opportunities and increase the mobility of our citizens. You can't just pick one thing. That's why the federal government created the MPOs as a way of having all the various entities involved in the expenditure of funds look at this as a network system, not as small jurisdictional issues. It's the bringing together all of these transportation networks that we have to look at. And we only look at it from a financial standpoint. We only look to make sure the money's there, not to say to design a project in a certain way.

Walter said during the presentation you mentioned there are hearings and meetings. I didn't find a difference between them so would you give us background on what the notice is, the participation, how the two compare and contrast.

Desmond said there are required public hearings where the format is there is a microphone available, you have a time limit and you can say whatever you want to say. They won't necessarily have the opportunity to respond to you, but they will record your comments, document them, and provide a written response as part of the environmental document they generate. It's not an interactive discussion about a project, it's more putting your comments on record to be responded to later. A meeting or open house is a non-formal hearing and there might be information stations set up and you could talk about different aspects of the projects or there might be a roundtable discussion format. These are very different types of input and discussion than a formal hearing. I don't know much about the required public notice standards for those hearings but I'm sure those are standard.

Martin said with a public hearing there's almost always a specific document which is the subject of that hearing and the hearing is with respect to that document. Whereas with meetings there may not even be a document yet. With a hearing the document has been made available for a specific period of time beforehand.

Kiesling said most of them require a legal notice.

Ruff said I understand what Martin's talking about regarding the larger transportation system. We've been learning that demand is driving our decisions. Transportation decisions drive other factors in a lot of instances, so transportation planning shouldn't not necessarily respond to demand. We should be coming up with a project that demands a new reality. I think there's a certain amount of conflict with that and Martin's comment. We have a sophisticated public in this MPO area that has an understanding of this concept, of how planning and transportation affects things in ways we didn't understand 10 or 20 years ago. Do you believe projects that have been on the books a long time can develop an inertia and a resistance to change even if there is information suggesting they should be changed?

Desmond said we've seen that happen primarily with state projects, for example the bypass. It was under designed and on the books for a very long time. I think on the local project level we haven't had them last quite that long. A lot of it goes back to how much input or control we have over the LPA decision making process. We have to discuss that more.

Ruff said at this point I still don't understand how much INDOT constrains flexibility in a project design. Some of this came in when we debated the large roundabout at Sare Rd and Rogers. There was a discussion that we had to use the last 2 decades of increase traffic to project into the future. You extrapolate from the past into the future and that's what you use to design and if you don't design that way you can't get federal funding. You can't say locally we're going to try to significantly reduce our VMTs and base our design on that. How much are the LPAs constrained by INDOT?

Desmond said I am not an engineer and I have not personally had to deal with the design standards and that process, so I am not an expert, but to my understanding there are design standards for different types of project and there are design exceptions that can be requested. Those can range from very minor things to significant things. In some cases it may be whether

the LPA goes by the standards or whether they're going to try to look for more creative ways and look for exceptions.

Cibor said you answered that accurately.

Dragovich said if you use federal funds, like the funds we manage here, you do have to follow those standards. If you use your local funds you have more flexibility with not having to meet those standards.

Kiesling said INDOT follows a lot of the federal guidelines.

Jim Ude said when you talk about design standards, there is a desired level of design and there is a minimum standard which is less rigorous. You can also apply for design exceptions. That would have to go through a process to show why you want the design exception and it has to be approved. That's as flexible as you can get when you're using federal funds.

Floor opened for public comment.

Nan Brewer is a founding member of the Bachelor Area Neighborhood Association. I'll try to stick to the process, but my experience with public comment for this kind of government project is specific to the Fullerton Pike project. I'll have to use that as an example. As the only Bachelor Area Neighborhood resident appointed to the Citizen's Advisory Committee for this project who was not a business person, developer, realtor or someone interested in changing the zoning for their property for future sale, I can verify that the public comments at the CAC meetings, not counting the third and final meeting where anyone making a public comment was told they would be removed from the chamber, the majority were negative. There was only one official public meeting and a second un-official meeting this past July and the majority of the submitted questions against the project have gone unanswered. It is not the residents who are demanding this type of road. Most of us only found out about this plan to make a road larger than most of this area's state highways a few years ago when it was published in the newspaper. When many of us called the Monroe County Highway Department about this road prior to that time, we were told it would be another connection to 37. We don't know what the exit of Tapp Rd will look like off I69 or what traffic will be directed at Fullerton onto our neighborhood streets and what types of businesses can go in this area. I think we should ask specific questions of how this road would improve the safety, property values and livability in Bloomington and even look at communities elsewhere. I'd like to have the MPO outline specifically their long term plans for the residents along this entire route since this project is not the same road or residential density it was 55 years ago. We deserve that information. We've long been told this has been in the master plan since 1960. The past examples in Bloomington and Monroe County at the 46 Bypass and W 3rd led to the destruction of homes or their conversion into low rent businesses, the cutting off of the communities from their neighboring schools and the creation of suicide lanes. I don't think we want to repeat the errors and poor planning of the past. There are many unresolved issues with this road project and the effected neighborhoods want to have real input in the process. In July we were promised a series of public meetings only to be told it was too late to change anything in Phase I. Even if it means extra money for design changes a more reasonable road would be cheaper in the long run and better for the community. A lot of the public process in this project seems to have been simply going through the motions, what you legally need to show you did, rather than listening to the real serious concerns about the project in terms of its safety as well as the wastefulness of putting things like turn lanes to nowhere or truck lanes when it's been proposed that this be a local truck route only. There are many specific issues that need to be addressed and we feel those have just been pushed aside. I'd love to see the process changed to get public input from the beginning rather than setting it out like these kinds of projects are a done deal.

Joan Keeler is a resident in the Bachelor Area Neighborhood. We've been supplied with bits and pieces of data concerning the Gordon roadway but we've been left to piece it together ourselves. There are many unanswered questions. The most productive meeting that we had was the one that was held in the courthouse where the community was rallied and encouraged to give their input. Things came back from that and there were changes made in the design in the project. Since then there has been no venue for us to ask questions and give more input into the final design. We were given the peak hours volume chart and I don't know what figures were plugged in to it to come up with the numbers that justify a two lane round about. The people in the area would like to see the roundabout scaled down so that we have slower moving traffic that is safer for a residential area and an area with a school. I would like to see a process that involves more education of the general public. We're not engineers. I don't understand all the data that comes our way. I'd like to see simple common sense explanations why things are being done a particular way. I'd like to see more education, more involvement for the public so we can support this project and be happy with this road.

Angie Archer is a resident of the Eagle View subdivision and a member of the BANA group. To answer the specific question about the process, I talked to Julie Thomas multiple times after January CAC meeting regarding all the developments of the Phase II design. We felt it was a positive experience in the July 2015 meeting. They were taking into consideration what we were saying and we were seeing things changed. We were very encouraged by that. Then we came to a meeting in January and we were told we could have no say in Phase II. There had been no interaction in the meantime. With the process it's necessary to ask for public input prior to the agreement with the design consultant. I think it would make sense if there is a project that comes up to have a public meeting and have a conversation with the public with the idea that the LPA will use their wisdom to make the decision but then to take the public input as well as the knowledge from the LPA to go to the consultant to find a way to make the project work for everyone. When I talked to Julie Thomas her response was we have to do the designing and the consultant work first but then you're already taken 5 steps forward and how is there any chance to take 5 steps back to meet reflect the suggestions of the public. That's what the public is looking for is a way to communicate so there can be involvement, understanding the LPA does have wisdom we don't have but in a sense trying to work together to create something that works for everyone. With Fullerton Pike as an example, maybe we have already taken 5 steps forward but how much money have we already saved in creating a smaller roadway from the July meeting? So the residents and citizens are asking can we take a step back and look at getting an estimate to change certain features like the continuous turn lane that runs through a bridge as well as the double roundabout into a single roundabout. Maybe if we are looking at creating a smaller, more appropriately sized road for the residential neighborhood and schools it would be worth the cost that we would incur to do a re-estimate so we could make a smaller and more appropriate roadway. If in doing so there are time constraints that can't be met, could this money be reallocated to other places in the community that need funding. This would allow time to obtain a more realistic designed roadway. We've been told we can change projects, so we're asking for that communication with the public. Another question people have asked is does the design firm receive a percentage of the project cost? In designing such a large roadway, is there some kick back we don't know about? That was a question one of the CAC members asked the public to look into. When we say LPA, it would be helpful for the community to know who the LPA is the public can go and ask questions to. The BANA group has been trying in the last 2 years to figure out who we talk to if we have concerns. Are the County Commissioners who we talk to? Do we talk to the transportation folks? As a community, part of the communication process that would be helpful is to identify who can you go and speak to? I really appreciate you allowing public comment. Thank you for listening to us. The final question is would you be willing to look at having a meeting where we could sit down with the engineering staff and the American Structurepoint folks and talk together about this.

Germaine Codran lives in the Highlands and I'm part of the BANA group. My comments will be specific to the Fullerton corridor and then later to the process in general. I have made

inquiries regarding the cost of redesign. I would like to state we are not pushing for redesign for its own sake, for petty reasons. There are legitimate and substantial reasons for our redesign request as we have stated in previous meetings. Most substantial is what we believe is the lack of consultation in the process. Between July 2015 and January 2016 we heard silence from the designers and the LPA. Six months of silence is not justifiable. Any resulting delay can be directly linked to this fact. We want actual figures for a redesign and we would like the MPO and LPAs to continue to work together to come up with a more public and responsive design to Phase II. We are not against this road per se. We recognize there is a stated need for it and we know there is 4-5% completion of the design but we are confident our questions and the number of people in the public bringing up these questions is substantial enough and reasonable enough to warrant a redesign. We do not want to be cited as an example of a mistake. We want the changes to be made now and be used as an example for how the public, the MPO and the LPA were able to work together to do a redesign that led to a better road. Lastly, I would like to suggest a threshold be developed in the process for when you can clearly say no more changes, let's say 50% of design, with the assumption that during the first 50% extensive public consultation is made because that has been a source of frustration. I have specifically asked the question at which point we could make changes and the response was it was too late already. To me that was inadequate and frustrating, so I would like a threshold to say no more.

Mary Ann Williams is a resident of southwest Bloomington. I appreciate the comments I've heard so far. I'm sensitive with the comments regarding the whole system. Faced with the prospect of building, paying for and living with a road conceived of 50 years ago when neighborhood schools and a church did not exist, residents of southwest Bloomington strongly urge planners and engineers to respond to these changed conditions. If a road must be built, let's fashion it with a view to the current and future needs of people in the area. Since the time I joined this process in December 2014, I've heard people complain they were not able to attend public comment meetings and when they did their comments were ignored or suppressed. We felt disposed of. 87 comments were generated in the NEPA process, 51 of the comments came back opposed or with strong critique. My suggestion would be that there be another meeting, perhaps not a hearing but a meeting so these comments can seriously be taken into consideration. In an effort to participate and influence the design of a roadway that will drastically change our neighborhoods we formed a neighborhood group, we have distributed fliers, we've written letters, attended meetings, done research and formed a listserv. In July we cohosted a meeting with Julie Thomas. 75 people came and no one spoke in favor of this road. 72 comments were collected at that meeting and sent to American Structurepoint for answers. At the January CAC meeting 6 months later with no additional consultation or input from the public, the current design was proposed. We do not know how that was decided on. We felt ignored. Engineers may think this design is acceptable, but do their standards include any factor of customer satisfaction or consideration of the people who will pay for and live with the product and endure its unintended consequences? We want something better. We want to uphold the spirit of dialogue as conceived by Bloomington's own Linton Caldwell and not trivialize it with a check off the box approach. We want a slow safe road with aesthetic appeal. My vision is of standing before the MPO and saying thank you for the inclusive process and leadership you exercised that led to a road that all of Bloomington can live with and not just tolerate. I have three documents for you.

Ruff thanked everyone for their comments. I learned some things and I have some ideas and concepts. I hope staff heard things that opened up some possibilities for things we can do to improve and make a more robust and timely process that's more standardized for future projects and maybe it can have some influence on the project these citizens have some concerns about. I do want to thank my colleagues and staff for setting this up and members of the public who came in to weigh in on this discussion. Though there was a lot of discussion about the specific Fullerton project, I think given the discussion we had leading up to it we can see how their specific comments fit in to the overall discussion.

McKim said the County Commissioners are responsible for roads in the county. They used to be called the Board of Highway Commissioners. That was their first responsibility and continues to this day.

Dragovich said the LPAs are the County Commissioners for projects sponsored by the County, the Mayor for projects sponsored by the City of Bloomington, and the Ellettsville Town Council for projects sponsored by the town of Ellettsville.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (non-agenda items) None.

- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – April 27, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – April 27, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – May 13, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

*Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)